

Application No. 09/744,771  
Amendment "B" dated September 21, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 12, 2005

### REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent in person interview held on Sept 7. The amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview.<sup>1</sup>

By this paper, claim 78 has been amended and new claims 98-101 have been added, such that claims 42-101 remain pending and of which claim 78 is the only independent claim at issue.<sup>2</sup>

The Office Action of August 12, 2005, considered and rejected claims 42-97. Claims 78-95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,754,905) in view of Dunn et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,664). Claims 78, 96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hooper (U.S. Patent No. 5,422,674) in view of Dunn. Claims 42-57, 60-66, 71-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Dunn and further in view of Rangan (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,771). Claims 59 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Dunn in view of Rangan and further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,778,098). Claims 67-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of Dunn in view of Rangan and further in view of Wolzien (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,606).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Initially, Applicants note for the record (as discussed in the interview) that this case is part of a family of cases including the following application serial numbers: 09/770,769; 09/770,644; 09/770,767; 09/770,765; 09/770,766; 10/975,693; 10/976,063; 09/744,771; and 09/744,662. In order to preserve any and all rights available to Applicants, Applicants will not provide a terminal disclaimer with reference to any of the aforementioned cases at this time. Nevertheless, one or more terminal disclaimers may be provided in the future if the Examiner deems it necessary.

<sup>2</sup> Support for the various amendments is found in at least pages 16-22, as read and reviewed during the interview.

<sup>3</sup> Although the prior art status and some of the assertions made with regard to the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art, as well as any official notice, which was taken in the last office action, at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise, such as, for example in a subsequent amendment or during prosecution of a related application. Accordingly, Applicants' decision not to respond to any particular assertions or rejections in this paper should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to said assertions or rejections.

Application No. 09/744,771  
Amendment "B" dated September 21, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 12, 2005

As discussed during the interview, the present invention is directed to embodiments for personalizing a broadcast stream. The method recited in claim 78, for instance, includes various elements such as providing a broadcast video stream; personalizing the stream at a central distribution station and in a manner that reduces a visual quality of said provided video stream, wherein reducing the visual quality of the video stream includes using different compression parameters for different GUI display elements of a frame within the video stream, and such that standard GUI display elements of the frame are compressed to a lower quality than unknown GUI display elements of the frame, while adding personalized information, and wherein reducing the visual quality of the video stream further includes selecting modifiable parameters for performing compression on the broadcast stream, and wherein selection of the modifiable parameters is based at least in part on a prediction of future frames of the broadcast stream; and transmitting the personalized broadcast stream to the user system using a compressed video transport.

As further discussed during the interview, and as generally agreed to, it does not appear that the cited art of record either anticipates or makes obvious the claimed invention as recited in the amended claims. In particular, among other things, the cited art does not appear to teach or suggest a method for personalizing a broadcast stream that includes selecting modifiable parameters for performing compression on the broadcast stream, and wherein selection of the modifiable parameters is based at least in part on a prediction of future frames of the broadcast stream.

The cited art also does not appear to teach or suggest any such method wherein the modifiable parameters are further selected at least in part based on identified capabilities of a user system (claim 98), wherein prior to compression at least one of the GUI display elements is

Application No. 09/744,771  
Amendment "B" dated September 21, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed August 12, 2005

modified in the broadcast stream to make compression faster (claim 99), wherein the compression is performed in such a way as to reduce scrolling resolution of a display provided with the broadcast stream (claim 100), wherein at least one item straddling a block boundary is moved in a display frame so that the item no longer straddles the block boundary (claim 101).

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are distinguished from the art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 21 day of September, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 44,803  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Customer No. 047973

JCJ:ppa  
W:\14531\107.2\PPA0000001117V001.DOC